

REC'D 10 JAN 2002

WIPO

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 99lee-1	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)	
International application No. PCT/KR99/00717	International filing date (day/month/year) 29 NOVEMBER 1999 (29.11.1999)	Priority date (day/month/year) 19 AUGUST 1999 (19.08.1999)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC IPC7 A61B 17/14		
Applicant LEE, Hee-young		

<p>1. This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.</p> <p>2. This REPORT consists of a total of <u>3</u> sheets, including this cover sheet.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).</p> <p>These annexes consist of a total of _____ sheets.</p>	
<p>3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <p>I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Basis of the report</p> <p>II <input type="checkbox"/> Priority</p> <p>III <input type="checkbox"/> Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</p> <p>IV <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of unity of invention</p> <p>V <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</p> <p>VI <input type="checkbox"/> Certain documents cited</p> <p>VII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain defects in the international application</p> <p>VIII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain observations on the international application</p>	

Date of submission of the demand 28 SEPTEMBER 2000 (28.09.2000)	Date of completion of this report 14 DECEMBER 2001 (14.12.2001)
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/KR Korean Intellectual Property Office Government Complex-Daejeon, Dunsan-dong, Seo-gu, Daejeon Metropolitan City 302-701, Republic of Korea Facsimile No. 82-42-472-7140	Authorized officer WON, Jong Dai Telephone No. 82-42-471-5612



I. Basis of the report

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

- ☒ the international application as originally filed
- ☐ the description:
pages _____, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☐ the claims:
pages _____, as originally filed
pages _____, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☐ the drawings:
pages _____, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
pages _____, as originally filed
pages _____, filed with the demand
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in written form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheet _____

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).**

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed." and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17).

** Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**1. Statement**

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-4	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1-4	YES
	Claims		NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-4	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations (Rule 70.7)

Reference is made to the following documents :

D1 : DE 2749875

D2 : DE 3712929

D3 : US 3642002

1. The prior art documents disclose a surgical saw used in narrow spaces and its blade that is situated in the same direction as its handle. But the subject-matter of claims 1-4 suggest a blade which moves at approximately 90 angle with respect to an approach direction of the handle and it also discloses the relative components. Therefore, the subject-matter of claims 1-4 is novel (Art. 33(2) PCT).

2. The prior art has problem. The direction change is not easy in cutting an oral cavity and a skin incision is required according to the circumstance. The subject-matter of claims 1-4 solves this problem by changing the blade angle. This problem-solving technique is not obvious from the prior art. Thus, claims 1-4 involves an inventive step (Art. 33(3) PCT).

3. There are no objections as to the industrial applicability (Art.33(4) PCT).